

REMARKS

In the Office Action of June 29, 2007, the Examiner requires election of one of the Species corresponding to FIG. 16 and the Species II corresponding to FIG. 18.

In response to this election requirement, we provisionally elect the Species I corresponding to FIG. 16 with traverse. Further, Applicant's disagree with the examiner's assertion that only claims 1, 9, 10 and 20 are generic. Claims 1, 10, and 18-20 are generic, and all claims 1-20 are readable on the elected Species I.

Although the examiner asserts that the Species I corresponding to FIG. 16 and the Species II corresponding to FIG. 18 are patentably independent or distinct, we believe this assertion is incorrect. As described in paragraph [0028] on page 5, paragraph [0039] on page 6, paragraph [0082] on page 18 and paragraph [0098] on page 22 of the specification, FIG. 16 shows a functional structure of the image browsing device 100 of the present invention, and FIG. 18 shows a flow chart for illustrating an operation of the image browsing device 100 according to the present invention. In other words, FIG. 16 and FIG. 18 relate to the same image browsing device 100, one (FIG. 16) showing the functional structure and the other (FIG. 18) showing the operation by the flow chart.


Therefore, contrary to the examiner's assertion, there is only a single disclosed species in this application, and all claims 1-20 are readable on this single disclosed species.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/30/07

By: 
Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300